



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Edh

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/848,848	05/03/2001	Hong Bin Liao	MS1-714US	8533
22801	7590	05/03/2005	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			PHAM, BRENDA H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2664	

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/848,848	LIAO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brenda Pham	2664	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18,40-43,49-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 8-11,14-18,40-43,49 and 50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 12 and 13 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 May 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-18, 40-43 and 49-50 are pending.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: page 13, lines 7 and 9, respectively, the co-pending patent application entitled "An Architecture and Related Methods for Streaming Media Content through Heterogeneous Networks", Serial Number, and filed date is required.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 8, 11, 15-18 and 49 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Geiger et al (US 5,987,022).

Claims 8, 11, 15 and 49, Geiger et al discloses a method and system for efficient transmission of network transport-layer protocol headers via a communications link, the method comprising: obtaining transport-layer protocol packets having associated transport-layer protocol header; compressing the associated headers; feedback-independently transmitting of a plurality of the

Art Unit: 2664

compressed headers via the communication link (see figure 4, col. 4, lines 33-39).

Claims 16, 17 and 18, although Geiger et al fails to teach a computer comprising one or more computer-readable media having computer-executable instruction that, when executed by the computer, perform the method as recited in claim 8, it is inherently include in Geiger et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 14, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geiger et al (US 5,987,022).

Claims 14 and 41 as explained in the rejected statement of claim 8 (parent claim), Geiger et al discloses all the claim limitation recited in claim 8. Although Geiger does not teach wherein the communication is wireless, it is well known in the art to implement header compressing method in a wireless communication network.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement a header compressing technique such as that taught by Geiger et al in a wireless network.

7. Claims 9, 10, 40, 42, 43 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geiger et al (US 5,987,022) in view of Jonsson (US 6,754,231) B1.

Claims 9, 10, 40, 42, 43 and 50, as explained in the rejection statement of claims 8 and 49 (parent claims). Geiger et al discloses all the claim limitation of parent claims. Geiger et al fails to teach inferentially determining whether there is an inconsistent context, wherein an inconsistent context is when one or more headers are not properly received by a receiver on the communications link, if not consistent, then refreshing the context to make the context consistent.

Jonsson, in the same field of endeavor, teach a technique for compressing header information to produce a compressed header portion of a data packet to be transmitted across a communication channel includes generating a checksum from the header information, and providing the checksum as the compressed header portion. If the checksum generated in the verification process matches the received checksum, then the verification process indicates that the reconstructed header is acceptable. If the generated and received checksums do not match, then the verification process outputs a NOT OK indication to the header reconstruction process. In response to the NOT OK indication, the

Art Unit: 2664

header reconstruction process outputs another proposed reconstructed header, after which the above described verification process can be repeated.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the step of correcting the header if one or more headers are not properly received by the receiver.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 1-7 allowed.

9. Claims 12 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

810. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art made of record fails to teach or fairly suggests in combination adjusting a sliding window within which the plurality of the compressed headers are transmitted, wherein the adjusting is modeled to react to TCP/IP window-size changes that results from the congestion procedures of TCP/IP; using the sliding window, W-LSB encoding the plurality of the compressed headers; sending the resulting W-LSB encoded plurality of compressed headers.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2664

Amri et al (US 5,535,199) disclose a TCP/IP header compression X.25 network.

Birdwell et al (US 6,032,197) discloses a data packet header compression for unidirectional transmission.

Euget et al (US 6,804,238 B1) discloses a system and method for transmitting compressed frame headers in a multiprotocol data transmission network.

Jonsson (US 6,609,224 B1) discloses a replacement of transport-layer checksum in checksum-based header compression.

Kari (US 6,434,168 B1) discloses data compressing on a data connection.

Koodli (US 6,608,841 B1) discloses system and method for achieving robust IP/UDP/RTP header compression in the presence of unreliable networks.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brenda Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-3135. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wellington Chin, can be reached on (571) 272-3134.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

April 21, 2005

Brenda Pham

